

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9143. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9144. A bill to provide that only certain official naval motor vehicles shall be allowed toll-free passage across the Mystic River Bridge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 9145. A bill to amend subchapter IV of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for the widows and children of veterans awarded the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9146. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9147. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9148. A bill to amend section 201 of the Social Security Act to revise certain provisions relating to the management and investment of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9149. A bill to revise and improve the financing of the administrative and loan fund provisions of the employment security program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 9150. A bill to establish a commission to conduct an impartial and scientific study and investigation to determine the effects on the public health of the practice of adding various chemicals to water supplies and food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 9151. A bill to provide that compensation of an individual for services performed while engaged in commerce, or as an officer or employee of the United States, shall be subject to State and local income taxes only in the State and political subdivision in which such individual is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9152. A bill to authorize the waiver of certain restrictions on appointment of cadets to the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 521. Joint resolution making technical corrections in certain provisions of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.J. Res. 522. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct certain studies and investigations relating to water pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.J. Res. 523. Joint resolution to prohibit officers and employees of the United States from treating communal water supplies with fluoride compounds, until a report from the Commission on Food and Water Contamination shall have been submitted to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

funds to complete the unrolled portion of Route 8-A of the State highway system from a point beginning 10 miles west of Denio, Nev., west to the California State line; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, Joint Resolution No. 5 of the Senate of the State of Nevada memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to define, and to cause the Attorney General of the United States to issue an opinion defining, the rights of State legislatures and agencies in enacting statutes and promulgating rules and regulations which apply to State agencies administering Federal grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 9153. A bill for the relief of Kwanghan Kim and his wife, Dukung Hyun Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9154. A bill for the relief of Otto Bagal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 9155. A bill for the relief of Stanley J. Moraski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

275. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., relative to requesting that the Congress of the United States shall lead our people in study and understanding of those principles of freedom which our first Congress proclaimed, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Joint Resolution No. 20 of the Assembly of the State of Nevada memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, over the past weeks I have stood repeatedly before this House and cited statistic after depressing statistic to bear out my contention that my State of West Virginia has been woefully neglected in the distribution of Defense Department sites, employment, and contracts.

My State, despite its many advantages, ranks a dead last among the 50 States in Defense Department spending and payroll, civilian and military. This, I submit, is an unfair situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have compiled other figures which indicate that the Defense Department is not alone in its discrimination against my State—where unemployment remains shockingly high and where jobs are desperately needed.

Apparently the Commerce Department has a similar disregard for the needs and rights of West Virginia. I have here a

list of Commerce Department employment in each of the 50 States, and the proportion of the total population which this employment represents.

Can you imagine where West Virginia stands? Again, at the very bottom of the heap.

West Virginia, with only 37 Commerce Department employees, has only .00184 of 1 percent of its total population on the Department's payroll.

I do not think one single Member of this House can fail to agree that this shocking story of abuse and discrimination deserves to be given fullest distribution.

When I was pointing out how the Defense Department has discriminated against West Virginia, I admitted that certain States were better suited than others for defense purposes. But I felt that, despite this fact, the evidence was clear that West Virginia had, indeed, been shortchanged.

By the same token, I am not suggesting that the Commerce Department install the headquarters of its Maritime Administration or its Coast and Geodetic Survey in a landlocked State such as West Virginia.

However, I am at a loss to explain how equally landlocked Idaho, with barely a

fourth West Virginia's population, rates exactly five times as many Commerce employees, or how an inland State like Colorado, with less than two-thirds as many people, merits exactly 10 times as many.

I can say that some regional offices would seem ideally suited for the Mountain State. But apparently the Commerce Department has not even considered locating these facilities in West Virginia.

For example, my State is highly air-conscious, since the mountainous terrain makes other forms of transportation difficult. Yet there is not one single Civil Aeronautics Administration employee in the entire State.

In the field of business and defense services, which could be a godsend to assist industries and communities in overcoming the effects of a lingering recession, there is not one Commerce Department employee in the entire State. This division, which offers facilities and assistance so sorely needed, is not represented in the State where it possibly could do the most good.

Mr. Speaker, I do not ask needless favors for West Virginia. I do ask for equal treatment and fairplay.

I believe that it is becoming more and more evident that many departments of

our Government, which ought to be concerned with helping stricken areas, have instead callously turned their backs on West Virginia, and until something is done to rectify this situation, I intend to keep bringing these disturbing statistics into the open.

Department of Commerce employees by States

	Number of employees	Total (1950) population	Em- ployees as percent of popu- lation
Alaska	1,077	128,643	0.8372
Maryland	2,884	2,343,001	.123
Nevada	80	160,083	.0499
Oregon	686	1,521,341	.045
Louisiana	1,056	2,683,516	.0393
Idaho	185	588,637	.0314
Colorado	370	1,325,089	.0279
Virginia	882	3,318,680	.0265
Washington	474	2,378,962	.0199
Wyoming	51	290,529	.0175
Montana	103	591,024	.0174
North Carolina	604	4,061,929	.0149
Utah	102	688,862	.0148
Indiana	504	3,934,224	.0128
Kansas	219	1,905,299	.0114
California	1,179	10,586,423	.0111
Arizona	80	749,587	.0106
Alabama	271	3,061,743	.0088
Florida	240	2,771,305	.0086
Missouri	338	3,954,653	.0085
New Mexico	53	681,187	.0077
Tennessee	250	3,291,718	.0075
North Dakota	45	619,636	.0073
South Dakota	47	652,740	.0072
Texas	531	7,711,194	.0068
New York	947	14,830,192	.0063
Nebraska	76	1,325,510	.0057
Delaware	18	318,085	.0056
New Jersey	268	4,835,329	.0055
Vermont	20	377,747	.0052
Georgia	175	3,444,578	.0051
Maine	45	913,774	.0049
Minnesota	128	2,982,483	.0042
New Hampshire	20	533,242	.0037
Massachusetts	172	4,690,514	.0036
Oklahoma	72	2,233,351	.0032
Illinois	278	8,712,176	.00319
Rhode Island	25	791,896	.00316
South Carolina	64	2,117,027	.0030
Mississippi	65	2,178,914	.0029
Arkansas	54	1,909,511	.0028
Connecticut	55	2,007,280	.0027
Ohio	211	7,946,627	.0026
Pennsylvania	269	10,498,012	.0025
Michigan	158	6,371,766	.0024
Iowa	62	2,621,073	.0023
Wisconsin	70	3,434,575	.00204
Hawaii	10	469,794	.002
Kentucky	57	2,944,806	.00191
West Virginia	37	2,005,553	.00184

Participation of Hodgenville, Ky., in the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment upon the participation of Hodgenville, Ky., in the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial this year.

The birthplace of Lincoln is located near this enterprising town whose fine officials and citizens have taken a great part in the celebration of this outstanding event. The progressive, cooperative spirit which pervades this community and with which its splendid citizens are imbued has prompted them to be significant participants in this event of national importance and magnitude. Their unselfish dedication to this cause elicits the admiration of all who love our country and its great leaders.

The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace Land Corp. devised a brilliant and imaginative plan by which the section of the Lincoln birthplace farm not owned by the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park is being released to schools, historical societies, prominent citizens, and individuals for their private ownership as historical heirlooms. In the words of the corporation:

This property has been divided into square foot sections to allow as many as possible to share in this wealth of American heritage * * * a treasure with national significance which can be passed from generation to generation with a pride of ownership second to none.

The truth of this is borne out by the fact that the deed which was issued to me, giving me actual ownership in 1 square foot, section No. A-202, parcel A, of the original Lincoln birthplace land, is framed and hanging in a prominent place in my office here in Washington.

These planners are to be congratulated upon their wisdom and foresight in finding such a unique and interesting way to perpetuate the knowledge, understanding, and love of Abraham Lincoln.

As their Congressman representing the Fourth Congressional Kentucky District, I take pride in giving recognition to all of those wonderful citizens of Larue County, Ky., who have had a part, large or small, during this Lincoln Sesquicentennial Year, in paying homage and tribute to the Great Emancipator. Truly it is an honor to be able to serve such "salt of the earth" people here in the House of Representatives.

Veteran Kicked Out as Temporary Rural Mail Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the people living on Rural Route 2, Brighton, Ill., in my home county of Macoupin, were saddened by the death of Mr. Rolland Ingham, who had served as their rural mail carrier for 32 years.

Before his death Mr. Ingham had appointed Mr. Eugene Arban as substitute carrier. Judging from numerous letters that I have received in the last week, Mr. Arban was a popular choice. For example, Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Krueger wrote, "We feel that Mr. Arban will be just as good in the next 32 years as Mr. Ingham was in the 32 years past."

It appears, however, that Mr. Arban will not get the opportunity to continue his good service to the people of Rural Route 2, not even as temporary carrier. Although Mr. Arban was named temporary carrier after Mr. Ingham's death, he suddenly was shifted back to the substitute position, effective September 5, and a man with no previous postal ex-

perience was appointed temporary carrier.

Mr. Speaker, while this procedure may have been legal, I believe most of my colleagues will agree that it is very unusual for political pressure to be brought to bear in the appointment of a temporary carrier. Normally, the substitute carrier continues as temporary carrier until the permanent carrier is appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the Republican administration's power to direct the appointment of a temporary carrier. I do wonder, however, that political intrigue should penetrate so far down into our postal system as to take away a few months' work from a man who has faithfully performed the task to the satisfaction of everyone on his route. It is especially remarkable when it is considered that the man so unceremoniously deprived of this temporary position is a combat veteran of World War II. Eugene Arban was a member of a bomber crew in the Pacific and suffered during 5 months' imprisonment by the Japanese. He returned to become a useful citizen of the Brighton community. He has served as commander of his American Legion post and as a member of his church's governing board. He also is active in chamber of commerce and masonic activities.

This Senseless Highway Killing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, with the delivery of our paper this morning we were confronted with the fact that over 400 of our citizens were killed on our highways over the Labor Day weekend. This senseless slaughter was due in great part to selfish disregard of the rights of others and points up the fact that the human element is the prime factor in highway accidents.

On the other hand, many people who died on the highways in the last few days would be alive if the manufacturers of automobiles had undertaken to build into their product a few simple safety devices that would protect front seat occupants from the inevitable impact with dash and windshield which causes so many fatal injuries.

Over the weekend I had the privilege of a demonstration of a patented device which operates on the front seat in the event of a collision with another car. The seat is so constructed that upon impact it tilts the passenger backward at an angle of some 30 degrees and thereby protects him from those head and chest injuries which in almost every collision are the lot of the unprotected front seat passenger.

The demonstration was arranged by an old friend of mine and at its conclusion I asked him to write me a letter

briefly summarizing the advantages of such an appliance which he did as follows:

COATESVILLE, PA., September 5, 1959.

The Honorable PAUL DAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to inform you, and Members of Congress, of the greatest invention to prevent automobile injury since the four-wheel brake.

This is the first major breakthrough in the field of packaging the passenger.

This device operates on impact in a head-on collision. At thirty-one one-thousandths of a second the leading edge of the front seat rises 20 degrees. When inertia takes place the seat rises another 10 degrees and moves forward approximately 6 inches. By this motion the seat absorbs all the whiplash and inertia that is trying to throw the passenger through the windshield or against the dashboard and the steering column.

There are three great advantages to this device. The first is that it eliminates all personalities. The passenger does not have to hook up or turn on anything. The device is completely automatic. The second is it eliminates whiplash, which is the common cause of death in automobile accidents. The third is, it also protects the passengers in the front seat in a rear-end collision. The device snaps the locks and lets the seat scoop the passengers forward, so the shoulders are not rigid and there is no snap permeated to the spinal column.

I would like very much to see this device receive its rightful recognition in saving lives.

Sincerely yours,

HEKMAN M. BREUNINGER.

In this connection I think it important to emphasize that I have no interest whatsoever in this device or its promotion other than that which stems from an abiding concern in the development of any mechanism that will reduce the number of deaths resulting from collision on our highways.

Incidentally, it occurs to me that our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might properly investigate the appliance in question and I am sure that a demonstration could be arranged which should prove convincing and might lead to its utilization, in the first instance, on public vehicles at all levels of government. The ultimate goal will not be reached, however, until this device, or a similar accessory, is installed on all automobiles at the factory.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Our Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, certainly the oil industry's growth in this country has been a close parallel to and indicative of the great progress which we as a nation have made during the last century.

The tremendous importance of this industry to our security and economy has

been demonstrated time and again over the past years since the discovery of oil in our country in 1859. This year the oil industry is celebrating its 100th anniversary; and in my own State of Florida, the last week in August was proclaimed as Oil Centennial Week in Florida. At the end of last year, there were 11 oil-producing wells in our State. Many celebrations and special events were planned to demonstrate the importance of the industry to local communities and the State and to express the feelings of good will which exists in Florida toward representatives of the industry.

Excerpts From Address of Senator Symington, Delivered at French Lick, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

FOR

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. HARTKE). Mr. President, on Saturday, August 29, most of the leaders of the Democratic Party in my home State, and members of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association gathered at French Lick, Ind., to hear an inspiring address by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I would like to share his outstanding remarks with my colleagues and therefore ask unanimous consent to have a report of his address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH LICK, IND., August 29.—"The American people should demand from this administration a fair return on their tax dollar through the more efficient organization and management of the three Federal agencies which use most of the taxpayers' money," Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said here tonight.

The Missouri Senator stated, "The record of many hearings before the Congress this year shows that billions of dollars annually could be saved in the Defense Department alone if that Department were organized in recognition of the nuclear-space age, instead of drifting along on the basis of tradition.

"Introduction of businesslike administration in the Department of Agriculture, plus sound fiscal management throughout the executive branch, would also cut out a great deal of misused tax money."

To support his conclusions about waste in Government, Senator SYMINGTON cited facts and figures. "Including estimates for this fiscal year," he said, "the total spending for the Department of Agriculture amounts to \$34.9 billion just since 1952. This is more money than was spent by all the previous Secretaries of Agriculture put together, in the history of that Department."

The Senator added that "in 1958 the administrative costs alone of the price support

program were 10 times as much as they were in 1952."

Senator SYMINGTON referred to the unsoundness of continuing to accumulate such large inventories. "Government investment in farm commodities," he said, "has increased from \$2.5 billion in 1952, to \$9 billion this year, and at the present rate of increase will amount to over \$12 billion by this time next year."

Turning to the question of financial management, SYMINGTON said he was "seriously concerned with the mounting national debt, particularly with the increasing cost to the taxpayer of servicing that debt.

"The Treasury Department has failed to follow the well-established principle of debt management, namely, borrow at the lowest possible interest rates, and spread the maturity dates as evenly as possible over the following years."

The Senator cited a number of examples drawn from the official records of the Treasury Department during the past 3 years. He said, "Last March the Treasury Department offered a 4-percent 12-year bond, of which the public offered to buy \$1.5 billion worth. Strange as it may seem, the Treasury accepted only \$619 million of this subscription.

"Just a year prior to that, investors offered to buy at least \$6 billion worth of a 3-percent 8½-year bond, and the Treasury decided to sell only \$1½ billion.

"Based on these and similar illustrations," the Senator said, "I have come to the conclusion that the taxpayer would be paying at least a billion dollars a year less for interest alone, if the Treasury Department had acted as a good banker for the people's money."

Senator SYMINGTON said, "By far the largest source of saving of the taxpayers' money could come from a reorganization of the Defense Department. Service rivalries, duplication of weapons systems, and the multiplicity of separate forces without centralized commands result in the waste of billions of dollars every year."

A Sectional Analysis of the Civil Rights Bill, H.R. 8601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a sectional analysis of my civil rights bill, H.R. 8601, which has been reported to the House. The analysis follows:

A SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, H.R. 8601

TITLE I (OBSTRUCTION OF COURT ORDERS)

Section 101 of the bill proposes to amend chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to obstruction of court orders in school desegregation cases. Accordingly, it amends that title by adding at the end of the chapter a new section. The measure would make it a Federal offense to willfully use force or threats of force to obstruct or impede court orders for school desegregation purposes; upon conviction, the offender could be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 60 days or both.

It further provides that other injunctive or civil relief against the type of conduct made criminal by this proposal is not to be

denied on the grounds that such conduct is a crime. In this regard, provision is made that any fine or imprisonment imposed for the violation of such an injunction shall not be in addition to that imposed for a violation of this section.

It further provides for the exemption of the acts of the student, officer, or employee of a school when the act is done at the direction of or is subject to discipline by an officer of the school.

TITLE II (FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR DAMAGING OR DESTROYING ANY BUILDING OR OTHER REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY)

The proposal would make it a felony, punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years or both, to move in interstate or foreign commerce, to avoid local prosecution, custody, or confinement after conviction for willfully damaging or destroying or attempting to damage or destroy by fire or explosive any building, structure, facility, vehicle, dwelling house, synagogue, church, religious center, or educational institution, public or private. Flight to avoid testifying in criminal proceedings relating to such offenses would likewise be punishable.

TITLE III (FEDERAL ELECTION RECORDS)

Section 301 would require the retention and preservation for a period of 2 years of any general, special, or primary election records involving candidates for Federal office. The Federal offices are the Office of the President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. It would include all records and papers in the possession of election officers relating to application, registration, payment of poll tax, or any other act requisite to voting in such elections. Provision is made, however, that where such records are required by State law to be deposited with a custodian, such election records may be so deposited and the duty of retention and preservation then devolves upon that custodian. A willful failure to retain and preserve the records is made an offense punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

Section 302 provides that any person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, willfully steals, destroys, conceals, mutilates, or alters any of the records required to be retained and preserved shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

Section 303 provides that such records as required to be preserved by this title shall, upon the written demand of the Attorney General or his representative to the party having custody, possession, or control of them shall be made available for inspection, reproduction and copying by the Attorney General or his representative. Demand, however, must contain a statement of the basis and the purpose therefor.

Section 304 provides that when a demand is made by the Attorney General, the record shall be produced either at the principal office of the person upon whom the demand is made or at the office of the U.S. attorney in the district in which the records and papers are located.

Section 305 provides that unless ordered by a court of the United States, neither the Attorney General nor his representative nor any employee of the Department of Justice should disclose any record or paper produced pursuant to this title except to the Congress and any of its committees, governmental agencies, or in the presentation of a case or proceeding before a court or grand jury.

Section 306 provides that in the event of nonproduction, jurisdiction would be conferred upon the Federal district courts to resolve any dispute which might arise in

connection with the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Attorney General by this title including appropriate process to compel the production of the record or paper.

Section 307 defines the term "officer of election" to include any person who under color of the law performs or is authorized to perform any function, duty, or task with any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other act requisite to voting at any one of the enumerated elections at which votes are cast for candidates for the specified Federal offices.

TITLE IV (CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION EXTENDED FOR 2 YEARS)

Section 401 would extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 2 years. Under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Commission is required to submit its final report not later than September 9, 1959. Provision is made in this section also for an interim report to be submitted to the President and the Congress not later than September 1, 1959.

Section 402 of title IV would remove any doubt as to the authority of the members of the Commission to administer oaths.

Section 403 would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, section 105(a), by deleting the words "in accordance with Civil Service and Classification Laws" and inserting "without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service Laws and the Classification Act of 1945, as amended."

TITLE V (EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES)

Title V would amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parent resides or works on Federal property which is not subject to State or local taxation.

Section 6(a), Public Law 874, now requires the Commissioner of Education to make arrangements to provide free public education for children residing on Federal property if the State and its subdivisions may not spend tax revenues for their education or if no local public educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for them.

Section 501 of the bill would amend section 6(a) to permit the Commissioner to make arrangements also for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty, whether or not residing on Federal property, where the schools usually provide free public education for them are made unavailable to them by official action of State or local governmental authority and no local public educational agency is able to provide them with suitable free public education.

Subsection (b) of 501 provides complementary amendments to section 6(d) of Public Law 874. The existing provision permits the Commissioner, when he makes the arrangements for provision of education for the federally connected children, to make such arrangements only with a local educational agency or with the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property on which they reside. Where this new category of children of Armed Forces personnel are involved, arrangements could also be made with the head of the Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the parents of some or all of the children.

Section 6(d) of Public Law 874 limits the arrangements to those which provide for the use of either facilities situated on Federal property or facilities belonging to a local educational agency. The amendment provided in subsection (b) of section 501 would make this limitation inapplicable where the Commissioner is required to make these arrangements for the new category of children.

Section 502 of title V of the bill amends Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. The proposal of the bill would authorize the

Commissioner of Education to acquire possession of any school building constructed with the aid of Federal funds after the enactment of the proposed amendments contained in this section, when the local educational agency which owns the building is no longer using it for free public education and the Commissioner needs the building to provide education for children of military personnel or for other children who reside on Federal property. While the school remains in Federal possession, the Commissioner would pay the local district a rental fee proportionate to its share of the cost of constructing the building.

Section 6(b), Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended, now requires applications of local educational agencies for the approval of construction projects, which must be filed before the agencies may receive payments to help finance such projects, to contain or be supported by various assurances relating to the authority of the local agency, and other relevant matters. The amendment proposed in section 502 of the bill would add to this provision the requirement of an assurance that any facilities constructed with aid under this law, the application for which is approved after the enactment of the bill, will be made available to the Commissioner in case they are not being used to provide free public education and that the Commissioner needs them to provide facilities for the education of children who reside on Federal property or whose parent is on active duty with the Armed Forces. Subsection (b) of section 502 would amend section 10 of Public Law 874.

Subsection (b) of section 502 would amend section 10 of Public Law 815. Existing law now requires the Commissioner to make arrangements for the constructing or otherwise providing the minimum facilities necessary for the education of children who will be residing on Federal property at the end of the next fiscal year if the State and its subdivisions may not spend tax revenues for their education or if no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for them.

Section 502(b) of the bill would amend this section to permit the Commissioner to make such arrangements to provide, on a temporary basis, such facilities for children of the members of the Armed Forces on active duty, whether or not residing on Federal property, where the schools usually providing free public education for them are made unavailable to them by official action of State or local governmental authority and no local educational agency is able to provide them with suitable free public education.

Section 502(c) of the bill further amends section 10 of Public Law 815 by adding a new subsection which authorizes the Commissioner of Education to take possession of facilities constructed with the aid of funds provided for by Public Law 815, under an application approved after the enactment of the bill, if they are not being used for free public education and are needed by the Commissioner, as minimum facilities necessary for the children residing on Federal property or children of the Armed Forces personnel on active duty. Possession would be taken under the terms and conditions prescribed in regulations of the Commissioner of Education. Payment by the Commissioner of a reasonable rental on the portion of the facilities financed with non-Federal funds would be required. Provision is also made for the return of those facilities to the school district when the district reopens those schools and makes them available to the federally connected children or when the Commissioner no longer needs the facilities for direct Federal operation purposes. However, the best interests of the federally connected children, the objectives of this proposal, and the commitments to the per-

sonnel employed in the direct Federal operation would be factors to be considered in determining the appropriate time for the return of the facilities.

TITLE VI (SEPARABILITY)

Section 601 merely provides that if any provision of this act is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

A New Pension Bill for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make a statement in support of a new pension bill for the benefit of veterans of World War I that I introduced today in the House.

As you know, these veterans are arriving at an advanced age in life and are being forced into retirement because of age, disability, and various other reasons. If it is not already the case, they are upon the threshold, as a group, of facing their waning years of retirement and old age without earning capacity to offset the steadily increasing costs of living. As is the case with all our veterans, we owe this group of men our national gratitude. It appears possible, through such proposals as I have included in my bill, to assist our World War I veterans in their old age on the mutual basis of need and reward.

It would be difficult to determine just how many veterans of World War I are already receiving some form of public assistance through State and local agencies. There are also undoubtedly certain sums of tax money being deducted on a personal exemption basis by the persons on whom many of these veterans have become dependent. These are considerations which should be, and I am confident will be, taken into account in any hearings held on a bill such as I am proposing.

My bill does away with requirements which presently exist to the effect that a veteran must be totally and permanently disabled in order to receive a non-service-connected pension, even the liberal construction of such requirements. A World War I veteran would automatically qualify for a pension under my bill upon reaching the age of 62 years, regardless of the degree of any disability he might have or the status of his employability, provided his income fell within the maximum limitations prescribed in the bill. This would correct one of the greatest and most glaring deficiencies in our present veteran's pension regulations. To demonstrate, let me quote from Report No. 537 of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I have the privilege to be a member. This was the committee report accompanying H.R. 7650, which has since become Public Law 86-211.

In addition, the committee has been studying the adjudication of non-service-connected disability pension cases and has reached the conclusion that VA regulations and their current applications are inadequate as they apply to the cases of certain veterans who have high disability and advanced age. In some of the cases examined by the committee, the VA has denied pensions to veterans on the basis that the veteran is employable, notwithstanding the fact that these veterans were above age 60, had high disability, in some instances, from 40 to 80 percent, and were earning far less than the amounts specified by the income limits.

It was noted that VA commonly denies employability in the case of certain farmers, despite the fact that the farmers are old and severely disabled. The denial is on the basis that the farmer is employable even though the farmer's income is very low and the farm which he controls is very small and occupies only a small part of his time.

It is recommended and expected that the Veterans' Administration will review its regulations as they relate to employability of veterans with advanced age and high disability to assure that these elderly veterans with high disability, who are meeting the income limits, will not be denied pensions on the basis of employability when they are not working a substantial part of the time at a gainful occupation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill will serve to eliminate that area of administrative discretion which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs feels has resulted in many unfair and inequitable decisions made by the VA in pension matters.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9134

A bill to provide a new pension program for veterans of World War I

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that a substantial number of veterans of World War I are in need of assistance today. It is therefore the purpose of this Act, as an indication of the appreciation of the United States for the service rendered by such veterans, to provide benefits, based upon the need therefor, to this meritorious group, as a reward for such service.

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 513. World War I veterans

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I who meets the service requirements of section 521 of this title, and who has attained the age of 62 years, a pension at a rate prescribed by this section.

"(b) If the veteran is unmarried (or married but not living with and not reasonably contributing to the support of his spouse) and has no child, pension shall be paid at the monthly rate set forth in column II of the following table opposite the veteran's annual income as shown in column I:

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
\$600	\$600	\$140
1,200	1,200	100
	1,800	50

"(c) If the veteran is married and living with or reasonably contributing to the support of his spouse, or has a child or children, pension shall be paid at the monthly

rate set forth in column II, III, or IV of the following table opposite the veteran's annual income as shown in column I:

Column I		Column II	III	IV
Annual income				
More than—	Equal to but or less than—			
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$140	\$145	\$150
2,000	2,000	110	110	110
	3,000	75	75	75

"(d) If the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate payable to him under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by \$70.

"(e) The Administrator shall deny or discontinue payment of pension under this section when the corpus of the veteran's estate is such that under all the circumstances, including consideration of the veteran's income, it is reasonable that some part of the corpus be consumed for the veteran's maintenance."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 15 is amended by inserting immediately below

"512. Spanish-American War veterans."

the following:

"513. World War I veterans."

SEC. 3. Section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Where a World War I veteran has been granted pension under section 513 of this title, pension may not thereafter be paid to him under this section."

Schedule of Hon. William G. Bray for the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in order to discuss the problems, interests, and wishes of the people of the Seventh Congressional District, I will meet interested persons at the various post offices in accordance with the following schedule:

Monday, October 26:

9 a.m., Oakland City.
10:15 a.m., Somerville.
11 a.m., Mackey.
12 noon, Fort Branch.
1:30 p.m., Owensville.
2:45 p.m., Haubstadt.
3:45 p.m., Buckskin.
5 p.m., Princeton.

Tuesday, October 27:

8 a.m., Francisco.
9 a.m., Patoka.
10 a.m., Hazleton.
10:30 a.m., Decker.
11:30 a.m., Vincennes.
2 p.m., Monroe City.
3 p.m., Wheatland.
4 p.m., Bruceville.
Wednesday, October 28:
8:30 a.m., Emison.
9:30 a.m., Oaktown.

10:30 a.m., Freelandville.
 11:30 a.m., Ragsdale.
 1:30 p.m., Bicknell.
 2:30 p.m., Edwardsport.
 3:15 p.m., Westphalia.
 4 p.m., Sandborn.
 Thursday, October 29:
 9:30 a.m., Indian Springs.
 10:30 a.m., Shoals.
 11:30 a.m., Loogootee.
 1:30 p.m., Alfordsville.
 2:30 p.m., Burns City.
 3:30 p.m., Crane.
 Wednesday, November 4:
 8:30 a.m., Harmony.
 9 a.m., Knightsville.
 10:30 a.m., Carbon.
 11 a.m., Brazil.
 1:30 p.m., Staunton.
 2:30 p.m., Cory.
 3:30 p.m., Poland.
 Thursday, November 5:
 9:30 a.m., Bowling Green.
 10:30 a.m., Centerpoint.
 11:30 a.m., Clay City.
 1:30 p.m., Coal City.
 2:30 p.m., Patricksburg.
 3:30 p.m., Spencer.
 Friday, November 6:
 9 a.m., Freedom.
 10 a.m., Gosport.
 11 a.m., Quincy.
 1:30 p.m., Eminence.
 2:30 p.m., Hall.
 3:30 p.m., Monrovia.
 Monday, November 9:
 8:30 a.m., Harrodsburg.
 9:30 a.m., Smithville.
 10:15 a.m., Clear Creek.
 11:15 a.m., Stanford.
 12:15 p.m., Bloomington.
 2:30 p.m., Unionville.
 3:30 p.m., Ellettsville.
 4:30 p.m., Stinesville.
 Tuesday, November 10:
 9 a.m., Solsberry.
 10 a.m., Owensburg.
 11 a.m., Kolen.
 12 noon, Bloomfield.
 1:30 p.m., Doans.
 2:15 p.m., Scotland.
 3:15 p.m., Newberry.
 4 p.m., Switz City.
 Thursday, November 12:
 8:30 a.m., Worthington.
 9:30 a.m., Jasonville.
 10:30 a.m., Coalmont.
 11:30 a.m., Midland.
 12:30 p.m., Linton.
 2 p.m., Marco.
 3 p.m., Lyons.
 Monday, November 16:
 9 a.m., Farmersburg.
 10 a.m., Shelburn.
 11 a.m., Hymera.
 12 noon, Sullivan.
 2 p.m., Fairbanks.
 3 p.m., Graysville.
 Tuesday, November 17:
 9:30 a.m., Merom.
 10 a.m., New Lebanon.
 11 a.m., Paxton.
 12 noon, Carlisle.
 2 p.m., Pleasantville.
 3 p.m., Dugger.
 Thursday, November 19:
 9 a.m., Odon.
 10 a.m., Elnora.
 11 a.m., Plainville.
 12 noon, Washington.

2 p.m., Montgomery.
 3 p.m., Cannelburg.
 Friday, November 20:
 8:30 a.m., Trafalgar.
 9:30 a.m., Nineveh.
 10:30 a.m., Edinburg.
 11:30 a.m., Franklin.
 1:45 p.m., Needham.
 2:30 p.m., Whiteland.
 3:30 p.m., Greenwood.
 4:30 p.m., Bangersville.
 Monday, November 23:
 9 a.m., Morgantown.
 10 a.m., Centerton.
 11 a.m., Brooklyn.
 12 noon, Mooresville.
 2:30 p.m., Paragon.
 3:30 p.m., Martinsville.

Labor-Management Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of this session of Congress action was taken on a labor-management reform bill. It is my hope that the President will sign this labor reform bill into law at the earliest possible moment.

When the subject of labor-management reform legislation came before the House last month for consideration I supported the bill that was favorably reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee, the so-called Elliott bill. This bill was designed to do away with abuses of union power that were exposed by the McClellan committee. These abuses included unwarranted secondary boycotting, blackmail, extortion, and picketing. It was also designed to protect the union members from being victimized by unscrupulous leaders and the general public from labor racketeers.

During the last few days of this controversy. I was pressured by both extremes to vote against the committee bill. Some pressure came from those antilabor elements who wanted a punitive law against all unions, other pressure came from those who wanted no bill at all. I felt that it was my responsibility as a Representative of all the people in my district, to resist pressure from both extremes and to support an effective and fair bill which would drive the hoodlums out of power without hurting honest, law-abiding unions.

I stated at that time that if the Landrum-Griffin bill were to pass in its entirety, Massachusetts and the whole New England area would suffer economically. It was my judgment that many of the measures included in the Landrum-Griffin bill were designed solely to prevent the unionization of plants in the South. While this bill paid lip service to driving racketeers out of the labor movement, it seemed to me that their real intent was to prevent any organizational drives by legitimate unions in the presently nonunionized South.

As you probably know, many of the Southern States now run ads in our papers asking industry to come south, where there is cheaper electric power furnished by public utilities, such as TVA, local tax rebates, and subunion pay scales. The committee bill, which I favored, was stringent, and would have driven out the hoodlums and racketeers while still giving opportunity for legitimate unions to operate all over the country as they do in New England.

I could not understand why plant operators in New England should pay high union wages and have to compete with low wage scales in nonunion Southern States.

I, therefore, voted on three separate rollcalls against the Landrum-Griffin bill. However, I also stated at the time that if the House and Senate conferees would agree on a fair and effective labor reform bill, I would be happy to vote for it. It seemed to me that was the only way we could have labor reform legislation that would serve the best interests of our entire country, labor and management alike.

I was, therefore, pleased that the conference report substantially adopted the Kennedy-Elliott bill and supported the position of such a bill against both extremes. In other words, the conference report as passed by the House and Senate was closer to the Kennedy-Elliott bill than any other bill, and, of course, that bill was patterned after the original Kennedy-Ives bill.

Without going into all the major changes made in the Landrum-Griffin bill by the conference committee, I would like to point out that the following changes safeguarding the rights of the trade union movement and the workingmen which comprise these unions were made upon the insistence of the Kennedy-led Senate conferees:

First. Subcontracting: The legality of restricting subcontracting in the garment industry in order to keep out sweatshops was established.

Second. Consumer appeals: The right to publicize nonunion goods to consumers, without causing a secondary work stoppage, is recognized in the conference agreement. Employees will also be entitled to publicize, without picketing, the fact that a wholesaler or retailer sells goods of a company involved in a labor dispute. All appeals for a consumer boycott would have been barred by the House bill.

Third. Organizational picketing: The conference report preserves the right to engage in organizational picketing provided that a petition for an election is filed within a reasonable time not to exceed 30 days. Unless the union won the election, the picketing would have to cease. The House bill would have virtually banned organizational picketing.

Fourth. Organizational picketing: The right to engage in purely informational picketing without filing a petition for an election is secured provided that the picketing does not halt the pickup or delivery of goods or the rendition of services by the employees of other employers.

Fifth. Primary strikes: The conference report recognizes the right to en-

gage in primary strikes and primary picketing, thereby eliminating the danger that the House bill would sometimes invalidate such picketing.

Sixth. Defense to picketing: Although the conference agreement contains a prohibition upon picketing an employer who has a contract with another union, language was added to the House bill which would make it a defense to show that the General Counsel had issued a complaint charging the employer with unlawfully dominating, maintaining, or assisting the other union.

Seventh. Union liability for damage suits: The section imposing liability on labor unions for damages in the case of unlawful organizational picketing was eliminated.

Eighth. Federal-States jurisdiction—No man's land: The conference report permits the States to take jurisdiction over labor cases over which the Board currently refuses to assume jurisdiction. Under the House bill the NLRB could have refused jurisdiction over additional cases. The Board's present jurisdictional standards are broader than they have ever been, thus insuring more unions and employers protection of the act.

Ninth. Economic strikers: The House bill contained no provision permitting economic strikers to vote in representation elections. The conference provision permits strikers to vote in representation elections within 1 year after the commencement of a strike.

Tenth. Struck work: The conference report preserves existing law on the question of the right of labor to refuse to work on struck goods. The House bill would have limited this right.

Eleventh. Bonding: The conference report places a \$500,000 limitation on amount of bond required to be taken by a union officer; the House bill had no such limitation.

Twelfth. Elections: The conference report makes the Secretary of Labor responsible for bringing suits in a Federal court to remedy improper elections. The House bill would have provided that individual members could bring suits in U.S. district courts to overturn improper elections.

Thirteenth. Membership lists: The House bill gave candidates for union office the right to inspect and copy from membership lists in union shops. Conference report restricts this to one inspection 30 days prior to an election without right to copy.

Fourteenth. Employer reporting: Conference strengthened immeasurably employer reporting section 203 which was meaningless in the House bill.

With these 14 measures incorporated in the conference report that were not contained in the original Landrum-Griffin bill, I voted for passage of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this conference report on the labor-management reform bill that has passed the Congress will protect union members and legitimate union activity in the overwhelming percentage of cases. At the same time it will eliminate the over-publicized so-called racketeering which has come from a very small percentage

of the labor movement which led to a public demand for this action. I am, therefore, pleased that I could support this sound and effective labor reform measure.

Address by Senator Long at Graduation Exercises, Loyola University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one of the finest honors which has ever been conferred upon me was the action by Loyola University of the South recently when the faculty of that institution presented me with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address on that occasion may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to extend him my hearty congratulations for this deserved honor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator very much. I doubt whether I deserve the honor, but I am flattered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to extend my congratulations to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG BEFORE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, MAY 27, 1959

It is indeed an honor to share the platform with your Congressman HALE BOGGS, and speak to you tonight.

Inasmuch as Congressman Boggs will not have the opportunity to speak tonight, permit me to say that he is undoubtedly one of the great leaders of the National Congress. If we are ever successful in making order out of the chaos that exists in the field of foreign trade, for example, it will be in large measure due to his enlightened leadership. The contribution of HALE BOGGS to the improvement of our National Government has been great indeed, but with each additional year he becomes more effective, more competent, more productive. All Louisiana is proud of your Congressman.

And now speaking for myself, it seems but a short time ago that I was receiving a bachelor of arts degree from my old alma mater. Time flies and things happen in a hurry after you graduate from college. May I be excused for failing to remember what the principal speaker said on the night that I graduated. I cannot recall a word of it.

The night was hot, I had plans for the evening. I wanted to get it over with. Let us hope that my experience was not in that respect a forerunner of yours tonight.

Yet on that June night of 1940, almost every man and woman in the class could have told you then and could tell you now some of the things that our President

Franklin D. Roosevelt was saying over radio that year.

He told us that our generation had a rendezvous with destiny. It was true.

We were not of the maturity or experience to become the heads of government and immediately provide the top leadership, but we had the good judgment to help the Nation choose good leaders and we played a part in deciding which direction American policy would take.

Few of us were privileged to make command decisions, but we supported those decisions. We provided the workers, soldiers, officers to make those command decisions successful.

Our generation saw America emerge as the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, and the leader for all free peoples.

We learned how to attain full employment for our millions of workers who had suffered a cruel depression. We discovered many of the secrets of the Dietz and made them available for the service of mankind.

We struggled successfully against totalitarian dictators, we were able to preserve the freedom of mankind in many parts of this planet.

Yet in spite of the best we could do, the dangers and the challenges will be even greater for you. Unless your generation measures up to those challenges, then the next 20 years will see world leadership pass from this Nation just as the last 20 years saw it come to us.

Such a result could spell disaster for this planet.

You will be in all respects equal to the task, and your achievements will be greater than those of my day if you can do two things, simple to say, difficult to achieve.

First by working in the right direction.

Second, by trying very hard to get there.

It has been my impression that most of our difficulties in this world and in this Nation exist because there are a lot of people working in the wrong direction.

You will be surprised to discover how many of them there are, and how powerful some of those people are.

Most of them do not think of themselves as doing anything wrong. Most of them are the victims of misunderstanding, on the one hand, or shortsightedness on the other.

Yet such people make it twice as hard for us to get good results. Some of them actually succeed in doing things that hurt their Nation notwithstanding their honorable intentions.

A few years ago, one of our best known Washington cartoonists, Herbert Block, better known as Herblock, published a volume of cartoons demonstrating his philosophy of life. He illustrated vividly one point that some of us never forgot.

Most U.S. Senators work hard, but many of them are working in the wrong direction. Herblock gives this illustration:

"Suppose I am a working man who is in need of a home for his family, and suppose my Senator is fighting against legislation which would help me to get a better deal. Then I am no better off because he is working hard. I would be better off if he had stayed in bed."

More than 30 years ago, a boy by the name of Roy Riegels played center for California's Golden Bears. He made what was perhaps the most famous run in the history of the Rose Bowl. It was a long run—just 6 inches short of 70 yards—but that was not what made it famous. The world remembers that run and remembers Roy Riegels because he ran in the wrong direction.

There is no reason to discuss here how Roy Riegels happened to make this mistake. The fact is that he did do it and that it typifies in this one memorable act out of a lifetime of acts, the many public officials, businessmen, and leaders in all walks of life, who all too frequently head out in the wrong

direction—and who often refuse, as Riegels did, to listen to the shouts of their teammates who know they have gone wrong.

Roy Riegels may have lost his direction temporarily, but he did not lose his courage. He played a lot more good football the next year. He was elected captain of the team.

When statesmen are going in the wrong direction it is even harder to persuade them to turn around and reverse their field. It is hard for a man to be certain that he is wrong; frequently it might actually be popular. It might actually appear to offer personal profits although the results may be bad for the Nation or for the world. A man might stick to his direction even when he realizes that what he is doing is resulting in more harm than good.

It is for these reasons that we should be fulsome in our praise of a man with the humility to admit his mistake and change his direction. The moral being: If you can't be right, at least be humble.

This misdirection applies to people on all sides. It applies to the businessman who selfishly demands things which are bad law from a legislator. It applies equally to the legislator who is more interested in serving again than he is in serving well.

So let me say this to the men of Loyola who officially take their place in the great arena of the world tonight.

When the great Scorekeeper marks your record down, be certain that all of your yardage was in the right direction. Or, at least, be certain that you tried to reverse your field before you scored for the wrong side.

Now a word about this thing of trying hard enough—time and again statesmanship is failing this Nation and this world because men who know what is right are not doing enough about it.

A great number of us feel that we are not maintaining sufficient armed strength to save this Nation in the event that we are forced to fight. Some of us were successful recently in offering an amendment to a bill appropriating money for the various departments of Government, stating specifically that no further reduction should be made in the strength of the Army or in the strength of the Marine Corps.

Those who represented the U.S. Senate, in conferring with the House of Representatives, threw in the towel on this issue in short order. When Members of the House of Representatives refused to discuss the matter, the Senators on the conference committee were quick to take "no" for an answer.

Some of us tried to force those who represented the Senate on the conference committee to go back and fight again for the position taken by the U.S. Senate. We lost, but we tried and we tried hard. If Senators who offered excuses for failure had voted with us rather than offer those excuses, we would have won. We will try again this year, and again next year. If we try long enough and hard enough we will prevail.

In dealing with other branches of our Government, we have frequently found that a Federal administrator can make a law work out the way it should work if he determines to reach that result. If he does not want it to work out he can find a thousand reasons why the law cannot succeed. The same thing is equally true of your Representatives in Congress, your Governor, your State legislature, your mayor, and your city council.

As a Member of the Senate of the United States, I have at times kidded other Senators about the excuses that some of them offer for their failure to vote for a matter which they admit to be in the national interest. It is either "too hot" or "too cold"; or perhaps a line from the recently popular song could better describe it: "It's the right time, it's the right place, but it's the wrong face."

At the moment, our Nation is failing to make itself understood among the 1 billion people of the world living in countries which

are opposed to communistic slavery. The prevailing view of the ordinary people of the United States and the prevailing view of the people throughout the world toward our foreign aid program is that the program is of benefit to the unscrupulous politicians. Many persons in Government as well as the vast majority of the little people around the world feel that the program should be reformed. The trouble is that there are too many people who take a defeatist attitude about the matter. They are not trying hard enough.

Then, let us consider for a moment the actual problem of mankind's hope for survival due to the threat of all-out thermonuclear war over Berlin, Germany, Korea, or other trouble spots.

How much has actually been achieved in working out some sort of an arrangement to assure that literally billions of innocent people are not exterminated in an atomic war?

How much is being achieved in making sure that the possible causes of war are reduced?

What has been done to assure that there will be some limitation of the battle area and that the combat forces will be confined to those limits should war occur?

What has been done to limit the size of nuclear weapons and to control the testing which is polluting the atmosphere of this earth?

Very little. Yet the Russians have as much interest in survival as we do.

We cannot forever excuse our failures by blaming it all on the other fellow. Sometime we should approach these international conferences with the understanding mutually that both sides will be condemned for failure to come back with some sort of agreement.

Certainly one of two things must be wrong: Either the approach has not been right or the effort has not been sufficiently determined.

We must try again, reconsider our approach, and try harder.

When statesmanship fails the people perish. Statesmanship cannot succeed without steadfastness to a worthy purpose. It cannot succeed without tireless effort.

The flags of this Nation have been at half mast for the past 3 days out of respect to the late John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State. In a number of ways, I differed with Mr. Dulles. I never disagreed with his purpose.

One thing everyone will forever admire about John Foster Dulles. He gave us everything he had. He drove himself to his grave fighting for a foreign policy which he had helped to shape. Any failure of his policy could not exist because the man failed to fight for it.

This may sound like simple words of advice, but I believe you will find that this advice will bring you a successful and satisfying future if you follow it.

First, be sure you are heading in the right direction and then give it all you've got.

Weapons of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with the deepest regret that I was forced to inform the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John W. Mahan, that I could not be with

him in Los Angeles to speak before the Veterans of Foreign Wars' annual convention on September 2 because of pressing business in the Senate.

I had hoped to pay tribute to the splendid work of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary and to pay particular tribute to the leadership of Commander in Chief Mahan, Senior Vice Commander Louis G. Feldmann—who has now been unanimously elected as the new commander in chief—Ted Connell, the new senior vice commander, and Robert E. Hansen of South St. Paul, Minn., newly elected junior vice commander in chief.

The leadership of these men has been extraordinary, and they deserve the congratulations of every American for their work in behalf of American veterans and their families, a strong national defense, and a vigorous community welfare program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "The Weapons of Freeman," which I had prepared for delivery on September 2, 1959, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEAPONS OF FREEMEN

Commander Mahan, officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, delegates and distinguished guests, it is an honor to be asked to address this splendid group of men who have given so much for the country we all love, who have served our country overseas, and who continue to serve at the community, the State, and the national level.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their auxiliary are a great power for good in this Nation of ours. I have had the privilege of seeing your effective efforts in my own State of Minnesota. I have seen the good work you have done for young people, for better, cleaner, more healthful communities. I have watched the enthusiasm and vigor with which you roll up your sleeves and go to work on a project. In fact, in just a few days, one such project will be completed, with the dedication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Cancer Research Institute at the University of Minnesota, to stand as a symbol of all that is unselfish, public spirited, and generous among the men and women who make up your great and vital organization.

I have always admired the way in which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been able to work tirelessly and effectively in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and at the same time give leadership and impetus to constructive proposal to help all our people.

So during this session, we saw your leadership working ceaselessly to secure a new Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs—which we should have—and at the same time working for a desperately needed balance in our Armed Forces, for urgently needed modernization of our conventional forces, for more airlift and close air support.

I have seen your splendid commander in chief and my admired and respected friend John Mahan, giving personal leadership not only to the cause of improved veterans and widows pensions, but also to the cause of preventing that tragic and senseless waste of young lives which we know as juvenile delinquency.

I count it my great good fortune to have as my friend and valued consultants not only Jack Mahan, but also your dedicated and respected director of legislative affairs, Omar Ketchum, the officers of the Minnesota department such as Department Commander Don Otte and Minnesota's brilliant

national councilman, Bob Hansen. The advice of men like these is not only welcome, but sought after.

And it is because of the great respect and admiration I hold for you men and your great organization that I wish to speak to you of a very serious matter this morning.

There is an old British saying: "Beware the hug of the bear." I hope that every American will remember those words when the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union begins what could become a spectacular Soviet success in his visit to the United States this month.

For Premier Nikita Khrushchev is a new kind of bear, so far as the history of Russian leadership is concerned. He is clever, able, forceful and vigorous—and dangerous. He kisses babies, he shakes hands, he is disarming in his manner.

But his mighty Soviet war machine is not disarming.

The Russian Premier is above all else a political man. He seems to prefer to outsmart his opponents, to trick them, to undercut them, to outmaneuver them. He can and has used force—as in Hungary—to work his will. He is shrewd, tenacious, and tough. He has survived forty years of purges, secret police, and all the other terrifying trappings of the Communist police state. He has either buried all his principal opponents, or set them to watching the machinery in obscure corners of the Soviet Union.

He would rather talk us into something than go to war about it. He would rather outsmart us, out maneuver us, out produce us, and out last us than to take the awful risks of a nuclear exchange.

The President of the United States has invited the Soviet Premier to visit this country. I support that invitation. And I support the President's visit to the Soviet Union.

The President has said that he hopes this exchange of visits with Mr. Khrushchev will "help create better understanding between the United States and (Russia) . . . and will promote the cause of peace."

I hope so. I truly hope so.

Khrushchev's visit to the United States may help to free him from some of the misconceptions about this Nation that he now has. It may help to convince him that the United States is stronger, wealthier and more unified than his own propaganda artists have painted us. Most of all I hope that he is able to see a Nation and a people who have worked hard, and who are working hard, to overcome great and serious problems, who are capable of enormous bursts of energy and of sustaining a high pitch of effort for years on end.

I hope he will have time to discover that ours is not a Nation of lotus eaters, not a people of soft touches. I think it is imperative that he understand that here in America there is an ever sharper and stronger competitive spirit than that which drives the men in the Kremlin.

And when he comes, let us meet him with the courtesy that is bred of strength and confidence in ourselves. We are his hosts. Let us listen to him, let us hear what he has to say.

But being courteous, we can also be candid.

Being pleasant, we can also be persuasive.

Mr. Khrushchev should feel the spirit of this people as well as see the face of our land. It will be both instructive and enlightening, I think, that the Soviet leader should hear and see precisely what the American people think and believe.

He should hear—without any shouting, discourtesy or demonstration—that Americans are ready to cooperate with the Soviet Union in every constructive way—but that we are opposed to the brutality, the oppression, the cruelty of Soviet imperialism. He should discover that the American people—not just what his propagandists call U.S.

ruling circles—are passionately united in their belief that man must be free to choose his own way of government, that no nation has a right to rule another, and that freedom of speech, of movement, of assembly, of religion are not just words in a book but rather are articles of a living faith and component parts of our social order. He must see that our people actually believe these are the God-given rights of men and women everywhere. He must know that free men are prepared to struggle harder, more stubbornly, more tenaciously, and more effectively than the forces of communism. He must learn that we are prepared to live and die for these rights. We have before and are prepared to do it again.

It will be a tragic mistake if our people are led to expect too much from the forthcoming exchange of visits, if they are permitted to believe that with perhaps a new era of diplomatic courtesy, the underlying struggle with the forces of world communism has come to an end.

Yes, let us be prepared to talk, to negotiate, to confer. And let us have unflinching patience. Under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust, let us earnestly and sincerely search for a way to reduce tensions, to minimize the chances of a terrible explosion into outright war, to persuade our opponents that it is in their own best interests to resist the temptation to turn to force.

But even as our President and the Soviet Premier are talking in the White House or the Kremlin, the two worlds they represent will be colliding at a thousand points. Today the forces lock together in the great city of West Berlin and in the wild back-country of Laos. Yesterday they were joined in Tibet, Budapest, and Korea. Tomorrow?? Who knows about tomorrow?

We are engaged in a total struggle—far and away more than a question of mere military force. In this kind of struggle—economic, political, diplomatic, intellectual, scientific, cultural—everything counts. Tanks are important. So are teachers. Missiles are vital—so is money. Atom bombs are weapons—so are airways, oil pipelines, and sea lanes. Trained divisions are required—but no less do we require doctors, dentists, and diplomats—the best we have, the best we can train, are needed to strengthen our own society, and to go out to represent us in Asia and Africa and Latin America.

Underlying it all is the yawning gulf between two societies—one which gives no importance to freedom and the dignity of the human person and the other whose very roots strike down to the bedrock of the Judeo-Christian heritage. With all its internal contradictions, the free world yet stands for the worth of the individual and a moral law.

I, for one, shall not be content to write off half the world as irretrievably lost to the dark forces that deny men and women the light of truth and the warmth of dignity and freedom.

If, then, we are soberly determined to carry on the struggle, then we should beware of falling into two grievous errors:

First, there is the danger that we may see only one narrow area of the struggle and overlook others equally important. If we become preoccupied with the military threat, we may forget the Soviet diplomatic, political, and economic onslaught. Equally dangerous is the tendency to see the struggle solely in terms of economics and politics, and to ignore the powerful military forces that confront us.

A second danger is the temptation to adopt the tactics and values of the adversary. It is said that we must fight fire with fire. In a sense this is true. We need missiles, jet planes, and ships to defend ourselves against missiles, bombers, and submarines. We need men to fight men. We must develop an international economic strategy to counter the Communist economic offensive. We need

the Voice of America to correct the distortions of Radios Moscow and Peking. In this sense we must fight fire with fire.

But we can never permit ourselves to forget that we are free men and that we can use these weapons only as free men use them. Communists have no such inhibitions. They can use their weapons with no holds barred, no qualms of conscience. If Radio Moscow lies about us and our objectives, it is not the part of free men to retaliate by lying about the Soviet Union. Russia can exploit her allies and send her tanks to crush a popular uprising in Hungary. But free men must respect the integrity of their allies and accept their criticism of our policies.

Yes, free men and tyrants may possess the same weapons, but they use them in a different way and for different purposes. Herein lies the fundamental moral distinction between the free world and the Communist world.

To meet the many-sided Communist challenge the arsenal of free men must furnish many weapons, not the least of which is the weapon of an effective diplomacy. Diplomacy is the art of bargaining, of fighting for what you believe by peaceful means at the conference table.

To be effective, a diplomat must speak from a position of strength. As Carl Sandburg once said, "The cockroach is always wrong when it argues with the chicken."

To go to the negotiating table weak or divided is to invite disaster.

The United States will not be able to negotiate an honorable settlement of the Berlin issue unless we are strong and determined, and unless our strength is reinforced by the strength of our NATO allies.

Negotiation is not a substitute for a strong defense. But negotiation is the indispensable handmaiden of military strength. Our willingness to negotiate is not a sign of weakness, but an indication that we want to explore every honorable path to prevent war on the one hand or capitulation to tyranny on the other.

I support the forthcoming two-power talks. I have supported all our efforts to negotiate with the Russians since the end of World War II. To be sure, we have not yet been successful in settling the German problem or in achieving an effective arms control agreement, but on the other hand have avoided a nuclear war, and not one square inch of Western Europe has been taken by the Soviet Union.

Just as diplomacy is no substitute for military strength, the instruments of modern war are no substitute for negotiation.

I am deeply concerned about our present military posture—as is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We are a powerful nation. We have many strong and reliable allies. We have the capacity for massive retaliation, although this capacity would be severely limited by a massive surprise attack.

Unfortunately, however, our capacity for retaliation, which serves as a deterrent to any hostile power, is not yet matched by our capacity to deal with limited aggression. We do not have near the balanced forces capable of dealing with all likely military contingencies. We are weak on mobility. We are weak on the tactical weapons and manpower required to rebuff a local assault. Our weakness in these areas tends to invite adventurous nibbling from the rim of the Communist world.

In the passion and determination to balance the budget, our military posture has been thrown off balance. In a desire to get a "bigger bang for a buck," the budget-cutters have tempted Russia to run a bigger risk with their rubble.

Civil defense, for example, has been almost criminally neglected. Yet a realistic survival program is critical in a balanced defensive posture. A solid civilian defense effort would add substantially to our deterrent strength.

Let me illustrate what I mean. According to competent experts a medium-sized nuclear attack on the United States today would kill at least 50 million persons, most of them as radiation casualties.

A comprehensive shelter program to protect against radioactive fallout could save as many as half of these victims. In other words, such a civilian survival program could strengthen our country by 25 million survivors in the event of a surprise nuclear attack. This is no small factor in the military calculations of a potential aggressor, to say nothing of the humanitarian values involved.

If a fallout shelter program could save 25 million American lives, and if it would serve as an additional deterrent to nuclear attack, why has our Government not embarked upon it?

The answer we are given is: "It costs too much." Well, how much would it cost? According to Rand Corp. studies and the Gaither committee report, a shelter program of this magnitude could be accomplished in 5 years with an annual expenditure of less than 10 percent of our present defense budget.

At present the administration is content with a voluntary, do-it-yourself, shelter-building program. How can we expect State governments, local authorities, and individual citizens to take civilian defense seriously when their own national government does not even require that shelters be included in new Federal buildings or in federally assisted construction?

Our military and diplomatic weapons would be as weak reeds without a strong economic underpinning. And here, though we are strong, we can be caught napping. Soviet production today is about 40 percent as great as U.S. production. But she is gaining—and fast. Her economy is growing at a rate of 7 to 9 percent. That is approximately three times as fast as our rate of growth.

In the realm of economics, world war III has already started. Premier Khrushchev has repeatedly boasted that the Soviet Union would overtake the United States and eventually win the world to communism by economic, rather than military, means.

"We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade," said Khrushchev on November 22, 1957. This boast cannot be lightly dismissed. Soviet sputniks and lunik should have shattered any remaining illusions we once entertained about Russia's technological backwardness.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has launched a worldwide economic offensive. The two main weapons in her ruble war are trade and aid, which she frankly regards as instruments of her large political purposes. She has succeeded in penetrating strategic countries in the Middle East and in south-east Asia. By her "no holds barred" economic tactics, she was able to precipitate a serious Cabinet crisis in Finland. I was in Helsinki when it happened, and I know what I'm talking about.

We must meet this competition by increasing our aid and investment program abroad substantially, and by moving hard to make better use of our tremendous reserves of real wealth in the form of American-produced food and fiber.

You can't talk democracy and freedom effectively to a family lacking food, health, shelter, and economic opportunity. The battle for men's minds cannot even begin until at least partial victory is won over poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

In the efforts to help the newly emerging nations of Asia and Africa and Latin America to help themselves, American capital is vital—an important weapon of free men. Through the World Bank, our Development Loan Fund, and the promising International Development Association, our capital can merge with West Europe's increasing capital

reserves to support economic growth in the uncommitted areas of the world.

One of the greatest of all our weapons in this vast struggle is that agricultural abundance which some consider a burden and a curse. Yet, if Mr. Khrushchev had our surplus of farm production, what would he not be able to achieve in the world.

Food and fiber in the hands of free men can accomplish enormous good. I have seen the way American food speaks for us. It is eloquent in pleading the American way of life—from Barcelona to Athens, to Calcutta and Seoul, Korea.

The food for peace program which I have urged for years, and which is now before the Senate, would permit us to use in greater measure our supplies of grain, milk, and cotton in constructive works of peace overseas. With food and fiber we could build hospitals, schools, and laboratories. We would take our food and fiber surplus production out of the storage bins and put it to work in the great world struggle.

The idea for a White Fleet first suggested to me almost 2 years ago by Cmdr. Frank Manson of the Navy—and on which we have worked together ever since—struck me as a most useful and dramatic way of carrying out one part of an expanded American foreign policy based on the works of peace. Yes, we could very well afford to provide a fleet of ships to help carry out technical assistance programs, particularly in the field of public health, along the coasts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And we could in so doing provide for disaster relief on a much greater scale, and much more quickly and effectively than we have provided in the past.

The deeds of a White Fleet would also speak eloquently of the American mind and the American heart.

It is significant that 34 of my fellow Senators joined me in introducing the White Fleet resolution, and that Congressman Ed EDMONDSON, of the House side, was joined by many of his colleagues.

The White Fleet could take its place among the peaceful weapons of free men. To heal the sick, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to rescue the distressed, to teach the illiterate * * * here are noble goals firmly rooted in the long American tradition. Pain, hunger, want, and illiteracy—these are worthy enemies—against which we should pit ourselves even if no Communist leader threatened to dominate the world. How much more vital it is, then, that we should throw our resources into the work of overcoming these evils.

Can we afford these great efforts?

How can we afford not to make them?

This magnificently endowed country of ours, this vast productive capacity, this free society which permits the energies of so many men and women to flow into the national effort can and will produce what is necessary to win the world struggle.

It will require planning, it will require decision making, but I am convinced that by voluntary planning, and if necessary sacrifice, our people and our free world allies can outproduce, outwork, and outmatch, and outfight anything that the Communists can put up against us.

And America can do this without becoming a garrison state—a modern Sparta. Indeed, we have the resources to become a modern Athens—rich in the arts of peace, strong in our arms and in our purpose.

A free people cannot expect to survive automatically. It is not written in the stars that because a society is free it will continue forever. Just because we are friendly and openhearted, the leader of the Soviet bloc cannot be expected to let us alone.

Th truth is that we cannot live without leadership, without purpose, without courage.

Edmund Burke, the great 18th century English statesman, warned us long ago when

he said, "Evil triumphs when good men fail to act." We must act—but action requires purpose and leadership.

It is clear that we have nothing to fear if we go boldly into the future, if we produce leadership wise enough to understand our dangers, bold enough to face them and plan their defeat, imaginative enough to rally our people to the task and the battle.

Tenth Anniversary of Chancellor

Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, September 15, 1959, marks the 10th anniversary of the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer. President Eisenhower has recently visited with him and paid him a tribute of respect and honor.

Out of rubble and ruins, the Chancellor and his Cabinet have built a strong republic, which is orientated westward and has done all and sundry to buckle itself as a staunch ally to the United States and Western democracies.

There is no doubt that West Germany, under the guidance of her leaders like Chancellor Adenauer and President Heuss, Foreign Minister Brentano, Economic Minister Erhard, and others, has realized that the mark of Cain was upon the Germans because of the terrors of Hitler and nazism. They worked feverishly to wipe out that strain and have succeeded in reestablishing West Germany as a liberal nation in the liberal world, dedicated to the principles of individual freedom and democracy.

A look at the map will reveal in realistic fashion that Germany in the heart of Europe must always be a buffer state on the flank of a free and democratic Europe. We do well to strengthen Germany by our insistence that East and West Germany be made one Germany. We do well to assure the world that we will never let Berlin down; that Berlin, now an island in a Communist sea, must be integrated into a unified Germany.

It is worthy of comment also, that Chancellor Adenauer, President Heuss and his successor, Dr. Heinrich Luecke, and the other praiseworthy officials of Germany have made, and are making restitution to the Jews in Israel and other Jews, whose property and valuables were filched from them by Hitler and his cut-throat bandits. That restitution, of course, cannot bring back the 6 million dead, but it can go a great way in the court of public opinion to show that Germany wishes to be rehabilitated, that Germany is repentant and that Germany is expiating her wrongs.

We all, therefore, hail Chancellor Adenauer on his 10th anniversary and present our compliments to President Heuss and his able successor in the Presidency, Heinrich Luecke. We present our compliments also to Foreign Minister Brentano, and Economic Minister Erhard for work well done.

Labor, the Strong, Vital Force of Our Nation, Is the Thrust Born in the Hearts, the Minds, and the Hands of the Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Labor Day in West Virginia, as is true throughout most of the United States, is a holiday truly dedicated in numerous appropriately located communities to the honoring of the men and women who toil that America be strong and remain free.

It was my privilege to have participated in one Labor Day eve observance at Morgantown, September 6, when I was dinner host to the executive committee for Labor Day celebration events in Morgantown, Monongalia County, and a public reception which followed.

My brief remarks on that occasion were a prelude to and extracts from two addresses I had the honor of delivering in areas of southern West Virginia on Labor Day. The first was the annual celebration at Harris Memorial Park, Smithers, Fayette County at noon, under the auspices of the upper Kanawha Valley local unions. The other event was the United Mine Workers' annual Labor Day celebration at Comfort, Boone County.

Several thousand persons were in attendance for each of these traditional programs in the largest bituminous coal producing State. The workers, whether members of organized unions or toilers in unorganized activities, were all accorded honors of the day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech which I delivered at these celebrations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1959, AT UPPER KANAWHA VALLEY LOCAL UNIONS' ANNUAL LABOR DAY CELEBRATION, HARRIS MEMORIAL PARK, SMITHERS, FAYETTE COUNTY, W. VA., AND UNITED MINE WORKERS' ANNUAL LABOR DAY CELEBRATION, COMFORT, BOONE COUNTY, W. VA.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the United Mine Workers, and friends, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with you in celebration of the one day of the year set aside for commemoration of the men and women of American labor.

"Labor Day differs," said Samuel Gompers, "in every essential from the other holidays of any country." Fifty years ago, the father of the American trade union movement stated that "all other holidays are in a more or less degree connected with conflicts and battles of man's prowess over man, of strife and discord for greed and power, of glories achieved by one nation over another. Labor Day * * * is devoted to no man, living or dead; to no sect, race, or nation."

This is the occasion on which we pause in the course of our own labors to acknowledge the sweat and toil of the men and women who created much that we see about us. It is fitting, too, that Labor Day should have

come to be acknowledged in the manner that it has. The product of no Executive fiat, no act of Congress—except for the District of Columbia—the acceptance of Labor Day itself is an expression of the free and voluntary character of the American trade union movement.

First propounded in 1882 by Peter J. McGuire, a carpenter in New York, every State has independently adopted the day which, in the words of Mr. McGuire, "shall be labor's—an occasion devoted to the industrial spirit, the great vital force of every nation."

This vital force is the thrust born in the hearts, the minds, and the hands of the worker. It is this force which has built railroads to span the continent and raised buildings to scrape the sky; it has built and manned our factories and gone into the bowels of the earth for fuel to fire them. All of these are the product of the efforts and dreams of the American worker.

In thus pausing to survey the achievements and reckon the gains of American labor, it is therefore appropriate for us to recall some of the milestones in the union movement. Some of you here have your own milestones—the struggles to achieve recognition, the victories and defeats of organization. You also recall the grim days of the depression. And for many of you, I am sure, the road has seemed long and arduous, a road along which you have been guided by hope, but on which you have met also with the face of despair.

But in the history of man and in the history of labor, 75 or 100 years is not a very long time in which to create a new institution. And let us not ignore the fact that the trade union movement is indeed just that—a new and compelling social institution in mankind's history. Only 50 years ago Prof. William Graham Sumner was still preaching to the bright young men at Yale University the doctrine that "every experiment only makes it more clear that for men to band together * * * instead of being a remedy for disappointment * * * is only a way of courting new calamity."

This was the typical and mistaken response of the conventional wisdom of the period when Samuel Gompers and a handful of other union leaders met in Pittsburgh in 1881 to form the Federation of Organized Trade and Labor Unions. Five years later this organization was succeeded by the American Federation of Labor—the same year as the Haymarket riot in Chicago. Since that time the history of American labor has been a chronicle of the march toward an ever broadening realization of the dictum of Mr. Justice Holmes that "liberty of contract begins where equality of bargaining power begins."

It is a record marked in its early stages by bitter and last-ditch struggles of management to resist the recognition of unions. The uses of injunctions, "yellow dog" contracts, and private labor spies live still in the memories of many union leaders and rank and file workers.

It was only 89 years ago that the first written contract was signed between coal operators and coal miners. Less than 70 years ago—in 1890, to be precise—and within the lifetime of the dynamic and dedicated leader, John L. Lewis—the United Mine Workers of America organized formally. While it was not until some 30 years later, in 1922, that the UMWA won its famous case against the Coronado Coal Co., in which the Supreme Court declared that a strike was not a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Though organized labor made slow but steady gains from the 1880's to the 1930's, its security was not assured until the arrival of the New Deal under the leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I am happy to have had a part in those exciting times as one of the original members

of the F.D.R. team in the Congress. For, it was our passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, which, for the first time, established national policy protecting the right of workers to organize and to elect their representatives for collective bargaining.

These are only some of the high points of labor's progress. The record has not been unmarked by violence on the part of both labor and management—we have had the Haymarket riots, the Pullman strikes, and Little Steel strikes. But in spite of the occasional eruptions of violence—in spite of the sometimes ruthless actions of reprisal—the chief mark of the American labor movement has been its use of legal and democratic methods to forge social and economic advancement.

The free American labor movement has confounded the Marxist dogma of class antagonism and has refuted the Marxist prophecies of blood and iron. Here, working within the framework of a cooperative capitalism, American labor most clearly distinguishes itself from many of its counterpart movements in Europe.

The goal of the trade union movement in the United States has not been to inflame the jealous passions of the dispossessed and the "have nots" against the "haves," but to seek a more abundant life for all. Karl Marx—blinded by his own sense of being an outcast—failed to see this; and present-day Marxist leaders—blinded by their own dogma of Marx and Lenin also fail to see this.

The wisdom of American labor's use of peaceful, legal, and democratic methods is apparent to us today. For organized labor has finally—in many areas—achieved full partnership with capital in the American productive system. With this increase in power, working men and women have won new rights. But these rights carry new responsibilities as well.

And the first responsibility is that which goes with all power—the obligation to use one's strength wisely for the benefit of the general good. This position—you know and I know—has not been universally and consistently upheld by all of our present-day labor leaders. This can be said also for the use and the abuse of power by some management leaders.

Our Founding Fathers wisely recognized that power is inherently dangerous. Therefore, they sought to disperse political authority as widely as possible within the Federal structure of government and between the Federal and State Governments. As our civilization has become more complex and our society more centralized the same problems of the distribution of political and economic power have developed within non-governmental institutions. Parallel to this development there has grown the need to erect and maintain democratic safeguards against the misuse and abuse of power throughout the range of American life—in the great communications media, in industry, and to a lesser extent, in labor.

I speak quite candidly on the subject of the labor-management reform bill recently reported by the Senate-House conference committee, accepted by the Senate, and awaiting House action, probably today or tomorrow. I was a member of this committee and participated for 12 days in the exacting business of its deliberations. At the outset I had determined that I would vote for those reform measures which had been revealed to be necessary by the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee, but that I would not associate myself with any punitive or repressive provisions which would restrict the legitimate rights of organized labor. I held as firmly as possible to that position, as did my Senate Democratic colleagues.

The bill as reported admittedly will not please every one. It does not fully satisfy

me. But it is doubtful that any law passed by the representative legislative process will ever be acceptable to all because, in such issues as these, there are as many points of view as there are parties to the discussion. But democracy is the art of the possible—and in this instance we have done all that could be accomplished within the latitude afforded by the differing versions passed by the two Houses of the Congress.

There has been much exaggerated talk at both extremes regarding Senate and House actions on labor-management legislation. And though it may take time to assess its impact, this I can state from knowledge based upon intimate study and contact with its preparation: It is a measure aimed at eliminating the racketeer element from honest labor and restoring democratic safeguards to those unions where they have been lost. These accomplishments can be brought about under the terms of the legislation without destroying the hard-won and legitimate rights of organization and collective bargaining.

In discussing the conference report in the Senate on Wednesday of last week, I said: I toiled to prepare a report which would be restrictive where necessary but would not be repressive to the legions of loyal labor so vital to the strength of our country.

At this point I state emphatically that, in my opinion, the conference chairman, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, spoke with complete accuracy when he informed the Senate, also on Wednesday, when he said:

"There were serious shortcomings in the reform bill which passed the House, and the conferees on the Democratic side, the Sena-

tor from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] shared my view that we could not under any circumstances have voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill. While many Members of the Senate hold an opposite view, if the Landrum-Griffin bill had come to the floor of the Senate in the form in which it passed the House * * * all the Senators would have regretted it finally. * * * And when we view the significant provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill, one after another, we must admit they go far beyond reform. They go into an area which would limit what we all would consider legitimate activities of men and women who bargain collectively."

But I do not choose to inflate out of its proper proportions the importance of the issue of so-called labor reform. Whatever the merits of the issue, the problem has not been one in the great body of the institution of trade unionism. This has always been, and remains so today, a movement necessary to the welfare and strength of a democratic system.

My concern for the welfare of organized labor in America goes deeper than the issue of reform. In these closing minutes I would like to address what seems to me a more fundamental issue—more fundamental for the labor unions and for the welfare of American democracy. I refer now to the loss of what might be called a "sense of mission." And I do not use the term lightly.

For the trade unions have always acted their best—as has the United States itself—when imbued with a sense of mission—a mission to perform not for themselves alone but for all Americans. This was the lesson

of the life of Samuel Gompers. It was from this sense of mission that the unions fought for gains for all Americans—for free public schools, child labor laws, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, social security, and a host of other advances which have been to the benefit of all American citizens.

Thus have the trade unions always best served themselves when they have served the American heritage, when their actions have been charged by the belief that they could create a future of greater worth and human dignity. This belief—this belief in the possibilities of man and the dignity of labor—has shaped the destiny of America.

American labor, led by the trade unions, is today a full participant in that destiny. But if we are to live up to the fulfillment of America we must live beyond the preoccupations of our particular job or craft. This is a responsibility which one cannot defer to his political or union leaders. It is an obligation which rests upon the individual heart and will of each of us.

"The American journey has not ended," stated Archibald MacLeish. "America is never accomplished, America is always still to build; for men, as long as they are truly men, will dream of man's fulfillment." This is the mission to which we must again rededicate ourselves; this is the mission which Samuel Gompers saw with such clarity.

Thus, as citizens and as workers, it is up to each of us to rekindle the faith in the American future, and to live with a renewed vision of the possibilities of man. We Americans have reason thus to live; whether we have the will depends upon the individual heart. And if we do so live, our work, whatever its nature, will be ennobled in its service to the greater benefit of man.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1959

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 5, 1959)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, in this our morning prayer we would open our faltering lives in penitence to Thy waiting might and to Thy cleansing grace. For the living of these days grant us wisdom for the problems we face, insight for these troubled times, and vision which sets its gaze on far horizons.

In the midst of events so staggering and colossal that as individuals on the confused world stage we appear so puny and inadequate, O God, who sittest above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we will ever know by using us, earthen vessels though we be, as the channels of thy purpose and intent. So may we serve the present age as we fulfill our high calling in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 21, 1959,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on September 8, 1959, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 8385), making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 981) thereon, which report was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we made a great deal of progress yesterday in the Senate, and I am hoping for progress today. I see no prospects for adjournment by this weekend. We have more than 100 bills for the Senate to consider. Dozens of them will have to be called up by motion and are of a general nature.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate some very important facts. When Congress is moving rapidly, no measure becomes law until it has passed both Houses and either been signed by the President or passed over his veto. There are several loose ends which must be tied together.

We in the Senate are interested in passing laws, not just going through the motions. There are many steps which must be taken before we can be satis-

fied that the public business has been concluded and fully transacted.

However, I do wish to inform the Senate that I believe we are heading for a very constructive record, and I hope the closing days of Congress will be productive.

If necessary, we will have another meeting of the policy committee later in the week to consider any other bills that may have been reported from the committees, if the committees meet today.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. We had an order yesterday that we will have the usual morning hour, with a limitation of 3 minutes on statements. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the housing bill is the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President